

REMARKS

Claims 5-29 are pending.

Claims 5-29 stand rejected

Claims 5-12, 15-19, 21, 23-24 and 27-28 have been amended.

Claims 30 and 31 have been added.

Claims 5-31 are hereby submitted for reconsideration.

No new matter has been added.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 7-15, 17-20 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the term “said users” lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Applicants note that independent claims 5 and 16 both include in the second element that a communication is received from a “a user among a plurality of users.” “Said user” in the remaining dependent claims refer to that user.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected independent claims 5 and 16 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Desai (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,493). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s contention and submit the following remarks in response.

The present invention as claimed in independent claim 5 is directed to a communication assistance system having a first database having a plurality of listings

therein each having at least one contact name and a corresponding contact number. A means is provided for receiving communications from a user among a plurality of users desiring to access the listings.

An operator terminal employs a search screen from among a plurality of available search screens, each of which maintain at least a partially different arrangement of content and search windows for receiving search terms to search for listings contained in said first database. The displayed search screen is determined based on criteria contained in a search request from the user. The operator terminal is further configured to receive the communication from the user and retrieve a listing from the first database using the displayed search screen.

Among other features, the communication system in this arrangement maintains multiple possible search screens for use by the operator terminal . These search screens each maintain at least a partially different arrangement of content and search windows. Then based on some criteria applied and/or information from the user's request one of the search screens is displayed for use by the operator terminal. Such a configuration allows for specialized search screens to be employed based on any number of factors (user's carrier, requested data type, etc...).

In one example, (e.g. claim 9) a service provider may request a special search screen such that user's who access the communication assistance system through such service provider are handled by an operator terminal employing a service provider specific search screen which could include certain promotions or other messages. Other applications, such as those included in the other dependent claims may also be employed.

The cited prior art, namely Desai teaches a directory assistance system that

employs DA - LNP (Local Number Portability) database so that called parties (or subscribers) can be reached on the same contact number, regardless of their local carrier. Such a system, although it employs an "operator terminal" (20,21), does include multiple search screens of different arrangements where the screen to be used is selected based on the user's communication to the system.

As such, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the present invention as claimed in claims 5 and 16. For example, regarding both claims 5 and 16, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a search screen from a plurality of available search screens, each of which maintain at least a partially different arrangement of content and search windows for receiving search terms to search for listings contained in the first database.

Regarding claim 5, the cited prior art further does not teach or suggest the displayed search screen being determined based on criteria contained in a search request from the user. Likewise, regarding claim 16, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the search screen being selected from among the plurality of search screen based on a predefined criteria.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not teach all of the elements of the present invention as claimed, and request that the rejection of independent claims 5 and 16 and the rejections of the claims that depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are currently in condition for allowance, the earliest possible notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner feels that an additional telephone interview would advance the

Application No. 10/688,769
Amendment Dated August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action Dated May 3, 2007


prosecution of this application he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number
listed below.

Respectfully submitted

SOFER & HAROUN, LLP

Dated:

By:



Joseph Sofer
Reg. No. 34,438
317 Madison Avenue
Suite 910
New York, New York 10017
(212)697-2800
Customer No. 39600